



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/717,674

11/21/2003

Hiroyuki Sakuyama

245673US2

9064

22850

7590

03/24/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

DANG, DUY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/24/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 12/18/08 has been entered and made of record.
Currently, claims 1, 7, 18 and 24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments (referred as Argument hereinafter) filed 12/18/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is noted that the Argument is based on the ground that Nishikawa fails to teach or suggest "***an additional information extracting unit which extracts the additional information from the compressed and coded data*** when the compressed and coded data is decoded..." (see page 6), the examiner disagree and would like to offer the following remarks:

(i)separator 340 of figure 5 extracts information 224 from compressed and coded data 260 and this meets claimed features;

(ii)claimed language does not specifically require to extract additional information before, after or at the same time with decoding. In view of Applicant's disclosed figure 9, step S2, it suggests decoding before extracting. Thus, Applicant's argument appears to be contradicted from Applicant's disclosure; and

(iii)the 102 rejection below is incorporated herein.

Specification

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishikawa et al., referred as Nishikawa hereinafter (USPN 6,246,438.).

Regarding claim 1, Nishikawa teaches an apparatus for coding and decoding (see figures 1 and 5-6 each comprises coder and decoder depicted at 40 and 50 respectively), comprising: a decoding unit which decodes compressed and coded data to restore original image data (decoder 50 of figures 1 and 5-6. Also, see analyzer depicted at 310 in each of figures 1 and 5-6 functions as the so called “decoding unit” according to figures 13-14 and column 10 lines 45-62); a storing unit which stores additional information other than the image data in memory (see memory depicted at 315 and 328 of figure 13); and a coding unit which encodes at least a portion of the additional information stored in said memory as information additional to the image data when performing second-time encoding of the image data decoded by said decoding unit (see re-encoding apparatus 30 of figures 1 and 5-6 comprising synthesizer 320 which functions as a second-time encoding and generates coded data 240); and an additional information extracting unit which extracts the additional information from the compressed and coded data when the compressed and coded data is decoded (see extractor/estimator depicted at 350 of figure 6;

separator depicted at 340 of figure 5; col. 17 lines 25-26: extracting data corresponding to the coded data”; col. 26 lines 3-4: “supplies...information 233 which is obtained in the course of the decoding”; col. 30 lines 23-25: “analyzer 310 extracts from the first image coded data 220 the quantization parameters”), and said storing unit stores the additional information extracted by said additional information extracting unit in said memory (see memory 315 and 328 of figure 13. Also refer to bus connection, arrow lines which can refer to memory to carry extracted information to synthesizer 320 from, for example, extractor 350 (figure 6) and/or separator 340 (figure 5)).

Regarding claim 7, Nishikawa further teaches a selection unit which selects whether to encode the additional information when said coding unit performs the second-time encoding (see searcher 329 and subtractor 330 of figure 13. Each or both refer to selection unit. Also see col. 29 lines 44-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa.

The advanced statements with regard to Nishikawa as applied to claims 1 and 7 above are incorporated herein. It is noted that claims 18 and 24 recite a computer readable record medium having a program embodied therein for carrying out the claimed invention as called for in

Art Unit: 2624

apparatus claims 1 and 7. While Nishikawa discloses coder and decoder as pointed out in the 102 rejection above, Nishikawa does not explicitly teach the use of such medium having a program embodied therein. However, it is well known in the art (Official Notice taken in the previous Office action dated 10/18/07) to use such medium having a program embodied therein for coding and decoding because program or software is simple, cheap, and easier to modify and/or tailor. It is noted that Applicant did not traverse or argue with regard to examiner's taken Official Notice. Therefore, Applicant's failure to adequately traverse the Examiner's taking of Official Notice in the last office action is taken as an admission of the fact(s) noticed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use such medium having a program embodied therein in combination with Nishikawa for that reasons.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duy M. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-7389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:00AM to 2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached on 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

dmd
3/08

/Duy M Dang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624